

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections be made prior to publication. This is not intended to provide an opportunity of a substantive challenge to the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

<hr/>)	
In the Matter of:)	
)	
PRINCESS TUCKER-JONES,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0201-11
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: July 25, 2013
)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
<hr/>)	
Princess Tucker-Jones, <i>Employee Pro Se</i>		
Carl Turpin, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On August 29, 2011, Princess Tucker-Jones (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Public Schools’ (“DCPS” or “Agency”) decision to terminate her effective July 29, 2011. At the time of her termination, Employee was a Special Education Coordinator at Drew Elementary School. Employee was terminated for receiving an IMPACT rating of “Ineffective” for the 2010-2011 school year. On September 30, 2011, Agency submitted its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned on June 16, 2013. Thereafter, on June 24, 2013, the undersigned issued an Order Convening a Status Conference for July 24, 2013. Both parties were present at the Status Conference. During the Status Conference, Employee submitted a letter of Dismissal of Appeal noting in pertinent parts that “Princess Tucker-Jones, party in the above-captioned matter, submits for request that the **Office of Appeals Matter No. 1601-0201-11** be dismissed.....This matter has been resolved through agency’s appeal process to the Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS).”¹ This matter is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The Office has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

¹ See Employee’s Letter received July 24, 2013.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

In her July 24, 2013, letter to this Office, Employee stated that the matter had been resolved through the District of Columbia Public Schools' Chancellor's Appeal Process on November 29, 2011 and as such, she wants the appeal to be dismissed.

D.C. Official Code §1-606.06(b) (2001) states in pertinent part that:

If the parties agree to a settlement without a decision on the merits of the case, a settlement agreement, prepared and signed by all parties, shall constitute the final and binding resolution of the appeal, and the [Administrative Judge] shall dismiss the appeal with prejudice.

In the instant matter, since the parties have agreed and executed a settlement agreement, and Employee has voluntarily withdrawn her Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal is dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Administrative Judge